DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 226 185 CE 035 047

AUTHOR	Waite, Linda J.; Berryman, Sue E.
TITLE	Occupational Desegregation in CETA Programs: The Record for Female and Male Hispanic, White, and Black Participants
INSTITUTION	Rand Corp., Santa Monica, Calif.
REPORT NO	Rand-P-6778
PUB DATE	May 82
NOTE	30p.
AVAILABLE FROM	The Rand Corporation, 1700 Main Street, Santa Monica, CA 90406 ($4.00).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Blacks; *Employment Patterns; *Employment Programs; *Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Ethnic Discrimination; *Federal Programs; Females; Hispanic Americans; Job Training; Males; Nontraditional Occupations; Public Service Occupations; Racial Discrimination; *Salary Wage Differentials; Sex Discrimination; *Sex Fairness; Whites; Work Experience Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Comprehensive Employment and Training Act

ABSTRACT

The occupational distributions in the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) programs and the wage implications of tnese for men and women of different racial and ethnic origins were examined. Data came from two projects on CETA, both using Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey data. One assessed the nature and equity of men's and women's CETA experience, the other--ethnic and racial differences. Relative to men with the same placement characteristics, women were more likely to enter CETA under Title I (basic education, job training, work experience services) and less likely to enter under Titles II and IV (public service jobs). Small or no effects of race and ethnicity on CETA occupational status and wages were found. Training or working in traditional male or mixed occupations gave women higher CETA wages than training or working in traditional female occupations. CETA wages were consistently lower for women than men in the same occupations, CETA service, or traditionality category. CETA employed 80 percent of the women and 57 percent of the men in occupations whose unsubsidized counterparts had the lowest wages and highest unemployment rates. In CETA training, CETA retained the percent of women in lower wage occupations but reduced the percent of men to 50 percent. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED226185

CE

OCCUPATIONAL DESEGREGATION IN CETA PROGRAMS: THE RECORD FOR FEMALE AND MALE HISPANIC, WHITE, AND BLACK PARTICIPANTS

Linda J. Waite
Sue E. Berryman

May 1982

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F Cockrell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE035047

P-6778
$4.00

The Rand Paper Series

Papers are issued by The Rand Corporation as a service to its professional staff. Their purpose is to facilitate the exchange of ideas among those who share the author's research interests; Papers are not reports prepared in fulfillment of Rand's contracts or grants. Views expressed in a Paper are the author's own, and are not necessarily shared by Rand or its research sponsors.

The Rand Corporation
Santa Monica, California 90406

INTRODUCTION

This paper examines the occupational distributions in the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) and the wage implications of these distributions for men and women of different racial and ethnic origins. Our data come from two separate projects on CETA, both conducted for the National Commission on Employment Policy. One (Berryman et al., 1981)[1] assessed the nature and equity of men's and women's experiences in CETA, a substantial part of the study being devoted to CETA's occupational desegregation record for women. The second (Berryman and Waite, 1982)[2] assessed ethnic and racial differences in CETA experiences, focusing on whites, blacks, and hispanics and on hispanic subgroups.

CETA's occupational desegregation record for women is important for several reasons. First, one of CETA's legislated purposes is to improve the economic prospects of its clients. As we know, substantially more female than male occupations pay poverty level wages.[3] Persistent occupational segregation parallels the persistent male-female wage differential, and differences in male and female occupational distributions account for over a quarter of the wage differential.[4]

---

[1]Sue E. Berryman, Winston K. Chow, and Robert M. Bell, CETA: Is It Equitable for Women? The Rand Corporation, N-1683-NCEP, May 1981.

[2]Sue E. Berryman and Linda J. Waite. Hispanics and CETA: Issues of Access, Distribution, and Equity. The Rand Corporation, forthcoming.

[3]Isabel Sawhill, "Discrimination and Poverty among Women Who Head Families," in Martha Blaxall and Barbara Reagan (eds.), Women and the Workplace, The University of Chicago Press, 1976, pp. 201-211.

[4]Barry Chiswick, J. Fackler, June O'Neill, and Solomon Polacheck, "The Effect of Occupation on Race and Sex Differences in Hourly Earnings," Proceedings of the American Statistical Association, 1974, pp. 219-228.

Even when labor force attachment is controlled, women also have much flatter lifetime earnings profiles than men.[5] Theoretical arguments[6] and fragmentary evidence[7] implicate occupational segregation in these profile differences. Male, but not female, occupations seem associated with career paths that carry wage increases.

Second, poverty in the United States is becoming increasingly female poverty, primarily as the result of the increasing number of female-headed households and the relationship between households of this kind and poverty.[8] Thus, from the economic perspective, the issue of occupations and wages for women is not transitory.

Third, CETA has represented a major federal lever for affecting occupational desegregation for women and women's wages. From FY74-FY80 19 million individuals entered CETA in job training or employment capacities, somewhat less than half of these being women. Thus, over time CETA has had the chance of affecting the occupational preferences and skills of large numbers of women.

---

[5]Isabel V. Sawhill, "The Economics of Discrimination Against Women: Some New Findings," Journal of Human Resources, Vol. 8, Fall 1973, pp. 383-396.

[6]Wendy C. Wolf and Rachel Rosenfeld, "Sex Structure of Occupations and Job Mobility," Social Forces, Vol. 56, No. 3, March 1978, pp. 823-844.

[7]Nancy S. Barrett, "Women in the Job Market: Occupations, Earnings, and Career Opportunities," in Ralph E. Smith (ed.), The Subtle Revolution, The Urban Institute, Washington, D.C., 1979, p. 39.

[8]From 1969 to 1979 the percent of female-headed households of all races increased by a third. For whites and hispanics, the increase was about 25 percent; for blacks, over 40 percent. Although the chances that a household of this kind was poor declined slightly over the decade, in 1979 they were still very high: 30 percent for all races and almost 50 percent for black female-headed households. (Tables 216 and 30, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 363. Population Profile of the United States: 1980, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1981).

Finally, CETA flows from early federal manpower programs of the 1960s and can be expected to affect future federal training and employment programs. Thus, even if CETA is virtually dismantled under the Reagan administration, its occupational desegregation record for women is of more than historic interest. As we show later, how CETA is structured and how men and women are funneled through this structure affects women's occupational options in CETA. Our experience with CETA has implications for designing future programs that would increase women's exposure to less traditional occupations.

The paper has five sections. The first briefly describes CETA's legal structure--its titles, their legislated purposes, and eligibility rules. The second describes the data base used in the two studies that underlie this paper. The third shows how the CETA title under which individuals enter CETA and their CETA activity (e.g., work experience) affect their occupational options. The fourth documents CETA's occupational desegregation record for white, black, and hispanic women, and the final section shows the wage consequences of women's occupational distributions in CETA.

DESCRIPTION OF CETA TITLES AND ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

For simplicity and because of data restrictions, we deal only with the formula-funded Titles of CETA: Titles I, II, and Title VI.[9] The major services available under these Titles were basic skills, job

[9]These are the Title numbers before the 1978 reauthorization of CETA and correspond to the post-reauthorization numbers of IIB, IID, and VI. This paper does not include Title III because most slots in this Title (Title IIIA or the Summer Youth Program) are jobs of short duration, intended as a mechanism of income transfer, and without a training component.

training, and jobs, although, as we describe later, not all services are available in all Titles. For example, basic skills and job training are essentially restricted to Title I. The purposes of the jobs also vary by Title. Most Title I jobs, called work experience, are income transfer jobs that are not expected to lead to unsubsidized employment. Jobs in Titles II and VI, known as public service employment (PSE) jobs, are expected to lead to unsubsidized employment, although the economic environments in which these jobs are offered presumably differ. Title II jobs are available in areas with high, long-term (structural) unemployment; Title VI jobs, in areas with short-term (cyclical) unemployment.[10]

The eligibility by Title varied, although, as we discuss below, Titles overlapped in their eligibility requirements. All of the Titles had eligibility criteria of economic disadvantage, underemployment, or unemployment. For Title I eligibility was restricted to those economically disadvantaged or unemployed or underemployed.[11] For Title II individuals had to reside in areas of substantial unemployment. They also had to be unemployed for at least 30 days prior to application or underemployed.

---

[10]Title II was targeted on regions with lingering unemployment. Title VI was designed to reduce the presumably short-term unemployment associated with the recession of the mid-1970's. However, as Mirengoff and Rindler observe, the unemployment rate used to define an area's eligibility for Title II was surpassed in most places by that used to define an area's eligibility for Title VI funds. Thus, de facto the distinction between the two Titles was eliminated. (William Mirengoff and Lester Rindler, CETA: Manpower Programs Under Local Control, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C., 1978.)

[11]To receive one of the small number of PSE jobs in Title I the individual had to be unemployed or underemployed.

Before January 1977 individuals were eligible for Title VI if they had been unemployed for 30 days, or, if they resided in an area with excessive unemployment, had been underemployed or unemployed for at least 15 days. After January 1977 the eligibility rules became more complicated. However, in general individuals could enter if they were: (1) unemployed or underemployed; or (2) a member of an economically disadvantaged family and (a) also a member of an AFDC family, or (b) unemployed and an unemployment insurance recipient, or ineligible, or exhaustee.

DATA

The Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey (CLMS)

Both studies on which this paper is based used CLMS data. The Bureau of the Census has conducted the CLMS quarterly since January 1975, sampling respondents from the previous quarter's new enrollees in CETA. Respondents are sampled from four CETA functional activities: public service employment, employability development, direct referrals,[12] and youth work experience (including summer programs).

The CLMS has two main objectives. First, it is designed to obtain characteristics of the CETA participants and the services they received, thus providing data not available from the usual sources, the prime sponsor reporting system. Second, the CLMS is intended to measure the effect of CETA programs on participants, including earnings and labor force status.[13]

---

[12]In a direct referral, CETA refers the individual to a job vacancy. The individual does not receive any other CETA services and does not necessarily get the job to which he or she is referred.

[13]The CLMS--sponsored by the Employment and Training Administration--samples mainly decentralized CETA programs, i.e., formula-funded programs operated by CETA prime sponsors. Thus, special

The CLMS comprises an initial intake interview, an activity record and several other interviews during and after the CETA enrollment. In the initial interview, the CLMS determines what CETA service the enrollee received (e.g., public service employment) and if the service was a job or job training, the enrollee's occupation and wages. The CLMS also obtains information on the enrollee's attitudes toward manpower programs and services received, what service and occupation the enrollee wanted from CETA, his/her trade or vocational training before entering CETA, veteran status, marital status, number of dependents, family composition, receipt of government transfer payments (food stamps, subsidized housing, AFDC, Supplemental Security Income, unemployment benefits and other public assistance), the enrollee's employment/schooling history in the previous year, wages or salary in the last year, and personal and family income by source. The CLMS contains information on the highest grade or year of regular school the enrollee attended, whether that grade had been completed by the time of CETA enrollment, and whether the enrollee had a high school equivalency certificate or GED certificate. Our analysis relies especially on detailed data on the enrollee's ethnic origin or descent and whether the enrollee was limited in the amount or type of work he/she could do because of problems in speaking English. We use all of this information in various sections of our analysis, either as dependent or as independent variables.

---

purpose programs such as the Job Corps (Title IV, reauthorized as Title IVB), Young Adult Conservation Corps (Title VIII), and several Title III (reauthorized as various Title IV) programs are not included in the CLMS file.

In our analyses, we use only data from the initial questionnaire and activity record, since our purpose is to assess the services provided within CETA and not to assess the impact of CETA services on later outcomes. We included all CETA enrollees surveyed by the CLMS during the period October 1975 through September 1978 in order to: (1) maximize the period covered by our analyses; and (2) maximize the number of cases available for analysis.[14] In each quarter, the CLMS sampled between 3500 and 4000 CETA enrollees and completed initial interviews with 3300 to 3600. To give us sufficient numbers of observations for race/ethnic groups by sex we combined (pooled) information for all quarters in the October 1975 to September 1978 or March 1979 time period (see footnote 7). Pooling observations across time periods provides large sample sizes which allow us considerable flexibility in the types of analyses we do and allow us to disaggregate the sample by sex and race/ethnicity. For the October 1975 to March 1979 period, the CLMS contains approximately 42,000 initial interviews.

Analytic Strategy

We assessed the impact of race and ethnicity on enrollee's experience in CETA in two ways.[15] First, we estimated a general

[14]We begin with October 1975 because the CLMS did not record CETA Title until the second quarter of fiscal year 1976 (October 1975). The sample for the multivariate analysis ends with March 1979 because CETA was reauthorized in October 1978 and regulations governing the revised Act were released to prime sponsors in April 1979. Since those enrolled in CETA in the third and fourth quarters of 1979 entered under revised guidelines, the data for these quarters are not completely comparable with early data, and we eliminated them to insure comparability. The sample for the cross-tabular analysis ends with September 1978 because data to this date only were available at the time this analysis was done (Berryman et al., 1981).

[15]We follow Census definitions; persons of hispanic origin may be of either race. We divide enrollees into whites (nonhispanic), blacks (nonhispanic) and hispanics of both race. We omit those of other races who are not hispanic.

linear model of each CETA outcome separately for men and women in which we controlled for all characteristics of the enrollee and the enrollment which were relevant for CETA assignment. This model included a series of dummy variables for race/ethnicity: white, black and hispanic. Second, we performed an analysis of covariance for each CETA outcome in which we tested for difference between race/ethnic groups in the slope coefficients in the model.

CETA AS A SYSTEM OF OPPORTUNITIES

We can think of CETA as a system for distributing opportunities of several kinds: (1) participation in CETA; (2) a CETA service or activity--basic education, job training in a classroom setting, on-the-job training, work experience, and public service employment; (3) an occupation for those in jobs or job training; and (4) a CETA wage for those in jobs or job training. Since this paper focuses on CETA's contribution to occupational desegregation for women, CETA occupations are the resource of primary concern. However, to interpret the data on occupations, it is important to understand that a CETA participant's occupational options are constrained by his or her prior CETA title and CETA service assignments.

An individual enters CETA under a title and a CETA activity that is authorized for that title. If the activity is job training or a job, the individual is assigned to an occupation and receives a wage in connection with it. Eligibility rules determine if an individual can enter CETA and under what title. Although these rules vary for different CETA titles, individuals can be eligible for more than one title, giving CETA prime sponsors some discretion in their title assignments.

Titles affect CETA service or activity assignments in that not all CETA services are available in all titles. Titles II and VI consist only of public service employment (PSE) jobs, and almost all of these jobs occur in these two titles. Title I consists primarily of basic education, job training in a classroom setting, OJT, and work experience activities, and these services occur only in Title I. In sum, Titles II and VI imply a public service job; Title I, a basic education, job training, or work experience activity.

As Table 1 shows, each CETA service has a different occupational structure and therefore different occupational assignment probabilities. All of the occupations available in CETA are available in each of the services, but the occupational emphases differ for each CETA service. Relative to the distributions for the other services, classroom training has the highest percent of clerical openings; OJT, the highest percents of crafts and operatives options; work experience, the highest percent of service jobs; and public service employment, the highest percents of professional/technical and laborer jobs.

Our analyses show that in FY76-78, relative to their eligibility, women 18-65 years of age were underrepresented in all CETA titles for all three fiscal years except Title I in FY78. Thus, women did not receive CETA resources, including occupational experiences, at rates commensurate with their eligibility. The discrepancy between eligibility and participation was greater for Titles II and VI than for Title I.[16]

---

[16]Available eligibility estimates for this time period are by sex and by race and other ethnicity separately. Thus, we cannot assess racial and ethnic differences in women's CETA participation, relative to eligibility. We can note that, relative to eligibility, whites are under-represented and blacks are over-represented in all three titles,

Table 1

CETA'S FY76-79 OCCUPATIONAL STRUCTURE BY CETA ACTIVITY

Occupational Category(a)	CETA's Occupational Structure (Percent)				
	All CETA Activities	Classroom Training	OJT	Work Experience	Public Service Employment
Professional/ Technical	10.7	6.9	4.9	6.7	15.8
Managerial/ Administrative	2.3	0.4	2.9	0.9	3.6
Sales Workers	1.0	1.2	3.7	0.9	0.3
Clerical	27.2	38.0	16.3	32.1	23.5
Crafts	12.0	20.3	21.5	6.7	10.3
Operatives	7.5	14.9	28.0	4.2	2.1
Transportation Equipment Operatives	2.7	1.2	3.6	2.1	3.3
Laborers	15.2	1.2	8.6	13.8	22.0
Service	21.5	15.8	10.4	32.8	19.0
Total or Average(b)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

(a)These are the one-digit census occupational categories. They exclude three categories that do not occur in the CETA occupational structure: Farmers and Farm Managers, Farm Laborers and Supervisors, and Private Household Workers.

(b)These may not add to 100 due to rounding.

When we looked at how female and male CETA participants distributed across titles, a logistic regression showed that relative to men with the same placement-relevant characteristics, women were more likely to enter CETA under Title I and less likely to enter CETA under Titles II and VI. Thus, they were more likely than men to receive basic education, job training, and work experience services and less likely to get public service jobs.

Although sex affected title assignment, Berryman and Waite (1982) found few effects--and no important effects--of race/ethnicity on the CETA title under which enrollees enter CETA. Whites of both sexes entered CETA under Title I and II slightly more often than did blacks or hispanics with similar characteristics. But these differences never exceeded about 3 percentage points and, although statistically significant, were hardly substantively so.

As noted, Title I consists of several CETA services: basic education in a classroom, job training in a classroom setting, OJT, work experience, and a small number of PSE jobs. Again, multivariate analyses showed that race and ethnicity had no or only trivial effects on assignment to CETA services. However, relative to males in Title I, women in this Title were placed more frequently in classroom training and work experience jobs and less frequently in OJT and PSE jobs. Although the percents declined across fiscal years, even in FY78 a third of all women in CETA were in Title I classroom training.

Thus, relative to men's occupational options, women's options were more apt to be those associated with classroom training and work

---

and hispanics are over-represented in Title I and under-represented in Titles II and IV.

experience. They were less apt to be those associated with OJT and PSE jobs.

We would like to use multivariate analyses to assess CETA's occupational sex segregation for racial and ethnic groups. Berryman et al. do not provide multivariate analyses for these groups, and Berryman and Waite do not provide multivariate analyses of the traditionality of occupations for these groups.

The occupational measure used in Berryman and Waite was occupational status, a measure that does not directly bear on occupational segregation. However, we can use our multivariate results for the effects of race and ethnicity on CETA title, CETA service, occupational status, and CETA wages to draw tentative inferences about these effects on occupational segregation in CETA.

We have already noted few, if any, effects of race and ethnicity on CETA title and service assignments. Our analyses of the impact of race/ethnicity on the occupational status of CETA jobs and job training showed mixed results. We found no differences among white, black and hispanic males in status of job training but lower occupational status for white and black than for hispanic females, net of other characteristics. For job status we found lower scores for whites and blacks of both sexes than for hispanics. As before, the differences tended to be statistically significant but substantively unimportant. The largest coefficient for race/ethnic groups appeared for black females in occupational status of job training and equaled five points on a hundred-point scale, the Duncan Socioeconomic Index.

Our results for race/ethnic differences in CETA wages reinforced the conclusions we reached for occupational status. Among males in job

training, we found no differences in wages, but among males in jobs, black males received wages 4 percent lower than those of hispanic and white males with comparable characteristics. For females, we found very small differences--on the order of 1 or 2 percent--but those that did exist favored hispanics.

The analyses of covariance allowed us to test the hypothesis that the process which determines CETA occupational status and wages depends on race/ethnicity. We found evidence of some rather minor differences. These analyses showed different effects of the variables in the models for race/ethnic groups on occupational status of CETA job training for males but not for females and for status of CETA jobs for both males and females. But few sizable differences appeared in individual coefficients in any of these models.

In sum, when we considered males and females separately, we found small or no effects of race/ethnicity on CETA occupational status and wages. These differences--where they existed--tended to favor hispanics over blacks and whites.

The remainder of this paper focuses on CETA's occupational distribution and its wage implications by sex, without regard to race or ethnicity. The conclusions from our multivariate analysis of the impact of race/ethnicity on CETA experiences argue for this approach. In addition, analysis of two sexes and three race/ethnic groups becomes too cumbersome and unwieldy for the small gain in analytic detail we receive.

OCCUPATIONAL DESEGREGATION IN CETA

Since FY74 millions of adult women have participated in CETA. In connection with the reauthorization of CETA in October 1978, CETA regulations directed prime sponsors to reduce sex stereotyping in employment and training. However, even prior to FY79, CETA--especially Title I--was expected to improve the economic prospects of its clients. Since traditional female occupations command low wages relative to mixed and traditional male occupations, it is reasonable to look for evidence that CETA tried to train and employ women in mixed and traditional male occupations.

In our description of CETA's occupational desegregation record, we use the CETA regulatory definitions of occupational types: in a traditional male occupation females constitute less than 25 percent of that occupation's labor force; in a mixed occupation, 25 to 74 percent; and in a traditional female occupation, 75 percent or more.

Table 2 shows the distribution of CETA job holders among traditional male, traditional female, and mixed CETA jobs by sex and race. For FY76-78, although only about 10 percent of the women in CETA jobs (work experience or PSE jobs) worked in traditional male jobs, CETA placed about 25 percent in mixed occupations. Data published elsewhere show that CETA's occupational desegregation record for job holders improved across the three fiscal years, the percent of adult women employed in traditional male CETA jobs increasing from 7 almost 12 percent, the percent in traditional female CETA jobs decreasing from 68 to 62 percent, and the percent in mixed jobs remaining stable (Berryman et al., 1981). Adult females showed slightly more distributional change across time than adult males, but neither sex showed large changes.

Table 2

DISTRIBUTION OF FY76-78 CETA JOB HOLDERS BY TRADITIONALITY OF OCCUPATION AND SEX

(Percent)

Sex and Race/ Ethnicity	Traditional Male	Traditional Female	Mixed	Total
FEMALE				
Total	10.8	64.1	25.1	100.0
White	10.9	62.8	26.3	100.0
Black	11.9	64.4	23.7	100.0
Hispanic	6.2	74.4	19.4	100.0
MALE				
Total	71.1	8.3	20.7	100.1
White	71.4	8.0	20.6	100.0
Black	70.5	8.2	21.4	100.1
Hispanic	70.1	11.0	18.9	100.0

Table 3 shows the distribution of those in CETA job training among traditional male, traditional female, and mixed occupations. CETA's occupational desegregation record in job training may be a better test of its desegregation success than its record for job holders. Since clients in job training presumably lack human capital in any specific occupation, prime sponsors' occupational assignments should be less constrained by clients' prior occupational investments.

Table 3

DISTRIBUTION OF FY76-78 CETA TRAINEES BY TRADITIONALITY OF OCCUPATION AND SEX

(Percent)

Sex and Race/ Ethnicity	Traditional Male	Traditional Female	Mixed	Total
FEMALE				
Total	11.6	49.3	39.1	100.0
White	12.6	46.2	41.2	100.0
Black	9.5	55.8	34.7	100.0
Hispanic	9.1	55.8	35.1	100.0
MALE				
Total	65.9	4.1	30.1	100.1
White	68.1	3.0	28.9	100.0
Black	63.3	6.8	30.0	100.1
Hispanic	57.1	6.5	36.4	100.0

Table 3 shows that while CETA trained about the same percent of women in traditional male occupations as it employed in those occupations, it did train higher percents in mixed occupations, reducing the percent in traditional female occupations to a little over 50 percent. As the data in Table 1 suggest and data published elsewhere (Berryman et al., 1981) show, the type of training activity (classroom

or OJT) had a marked effect on traditionality of the occupation in which the person is trained. Relative to OJT, a classroom training assignment increased women's chances of being trained in traditional female occupations by about 60 percent. It decreased the chances of being in a mixed occupation by about the same amount. Although classroom training assignments reduced female chances of being trained in a traditional male occupation, the effects were not as great for this as for the other two occupational types.

The data reveal that OJT increased women's chances of being trained in mixed and traditional male occupations primarily as a function of OJT's occupational mix, not of less traditional occupational assignments for females in OJT. OJT contains much larger proportions of traditional male and mixed occupations. Thus, although women entered the OJT traditional female slots in disproportionate numbers, the small numbers of these slots in OJT forced some occupational desegregation. These data indicate that if CETA increases women's OJT participation, they will simultaneously increase occupational desegregation for women.

Table 4 shows whether, relative to the occupation of their last pre-CETA job, adult female and male CETA job holders stayed in the same occupational type or moved to a new one. Thus, for those in pre-CETA occupations traditional for their sex, this table shows how much CETA changed participants' occupational patterns. For those in pre-CETA mixed occupations or occupations nontraditional for their sex, they show CETA's ability to continue participants' occupational patterns.

About 75 percent of adult females who had traditionally female pre-CETA jobs entered traditionally female CETA jobs. Of those who moved out of traditionally female pre-CETA jobs, over two-thirds entered mixed CETA jobs.

Table 4

OCCUPATION OF LAST PRE-CETA JOB BY OCCUPATION OF CETA JOB FOR MALES AND FEMALES

(FY76-78)
(Percent)

Occupation in Pre-CETA Job	Occupation of CETA Job			
	Traditional Male Job	Traditional Female Job	Mixed Job	Total
FEMALE				
Traditional Male	37.6	43.4	19.0	100.0
Traditional Female	6.8	75.8	17.4	100.0
Mixed	9.9	44.8	45.3	100.0
MALE				
Traditional Male	84.0	4.2	11.9	100.1
Traditional Female	39.4	37.2	23.4	100.0
Mixed	54.0	7.6	38.4	100.0

For adult females whose last pre-CETA job was a traditionally male occupation, CETA retained less than 40 percent in their pre-CETA occupational type and placed more than 40 percent in traditionally female occupations. For females who had pre-CETA mixed jobs, CETA retained 45 percent in the same occupational type, placing over 40 percent in traditional female occupations.

Adult males had patterns similar to those of their female counterparts, but their redistributions among categories differed somewhat from the female redistributions. A traditional male pre-CETA job had more holding power for males than a traditional female pre-CETA job had for females; less than 20 percent of the males shifted out of this category. Males shifted out of traditional female pre-CETA jobs at almost the same rate as females shifted out of traditional male pre-CETA jobs. They shifted out of mixed occupations at higher rates.

In sum, for those who had pre-CETA occupations traditional for their sex, CETA changed the occupational type of proportionately more females than males. For those with pre-CETA mixed occupations or occupations nontraditional for their sex, CETA retained the same or a higher percent of females than males in CETA occupations of the same type. However, CETA did not shift three-quarters of those females with traditionally female pre-CETA occupations into mixed or traditional male occupations. They did not retain even half of those women in pre-CETA mixed or traditional male occupations in occupations of the same type and placed most of the changers in traditional female occupations, not mixed or traditional male occupations.

Finally, we can ask about CETA's record in meeting clients' occupational preferences, as expressed in traditionality terms. In each fiscal year more than half of the adult female respondents indicated that they had had occupational preferences at the time of CETA entry.[17] For those who expressed preferences, an increasing proportion

[17]The percentages were 65 percent, 57 percent, and 59 percent for FY76, FY77, and FY78, respectively. The occupational preference data came from questions on the CLMS that asked: "Did you want a certain kind of (job/job training) when you visited the manpower office?" [If Yes] "What was the (job/job training) that you wanted?"

wanted traditional male jobs across time (5 percent to 10 percent). However, the total percent was still small. The majority--but a declining majority (from 69 percent in FY76 to 55 percent in FY78)--wanted traditional female jobs. An increasing proportion (from 26 percent to 35 percent) wanted mixed jobs.

The data on occupational preferences should be treated with caution. Participants answered the preference question after they had enrolled in CETA and most had been assigned to an occupation. Their responses may be biased in the direction of their post-enrollment occupational assignments. If they had no pre-enrollment preferences, they may have responded to this question by naming their assigned CETA occupation. If they were assigned to an occupation different from their preference, they may have accommodated to the discrepancy by modifying their original preference. Both of these potential biases would produce over-estimates of the match between preferred and actual assignment. As such, our data on the match between preferred and actual occupational assignments represent the maximum responsiveness of CETA to clients' preferences.

Table 5 shows the CETA occupational distribution of adult females relative to their preferences at CETA entry. Less than half of the females who wanted traditional male or mixed jobs got them. Of the females who wanted and failed to get traditional male jobs, 69 percent ended up in traditional female jobs. Similarly, of the females who wanted and did not get mixed jobs, 82 percent ended up in traditional female jobs. Over 75 percent of the women who wanted to get traditional female jobs got them. Of those who wanted and failed to get traditional female jobs, almost 75 percent got mixed, not traditional male, jobs.

Table 5

DISTRIBUTION OF DESIRED OCCUPATION BY OBTAINED OCCUPATION FOR MALE AND FEMALE CETA JOB HOLDERS

(FY76-78)
(Percent)

Occupation of Pre-CETA Job	Occupation of CETA Job			
	Traditional Male Job	Traditional Female Job	Mixed Job	Total
FEMALE				
Traditional Male	41.6	40.5	17.9	100.0
Traditional Female	6.1	77.9	16.0	100.0
Mixed	9.7	43.4	46.8	100.0
MALE				
Traditional Male	84.6	4.2	11.3	100.0
Traditional Female	31.9	43.9	24.2	100.0
Mixed	50.1	7.6	42.3	100.0

In sum, from FY76-78 CETA employed or trained less than half of its female participants in traditional male or mixed occupations. The percents increased across fiscal years and were higher in OJT than in CETA's classroom training or job services. Relative to the female percent in the particular CETA service, females in OJT were in fact much more likely to be assigned to traditional female occupations than females in classroom training. OJT's better occupational desegregation

record was attributable to the small number of traditional female occupational slots in that activity. For women whose last pre-CETA job had been a traditional male or mixed occupation, CETA employed less than half in occupations of the same traditionality type, shifting almost half of the "movers" into traditional female occupations. For women whose last pre-CETA job had been a traditional female occupation, CETA shifted 25 percent to a mixed or traditional male occupation--primarily to the former. Finally, for women who had occupational preferences at CETA entry, the match between preferred and actual CETA occupation was much higher for those with traditional female preferences than for those with traditional male or mixed preferences.

WAGE IMPLICATIONS OF CETA OCCUPATIONS

The low wages of traditional female occupations are one of the primary reasons for trying to desegregate occupations for women. From this perspective wages are the critical basis for judging women's occupational experiences in CETA. We examine their wages during CETA and the wages paid in the unsubsidized sector for the CETA occupation in which they trained or were employed.

In-CETA Wages

We assess the CETA wage implications of female CETA occupational assignments in three ways: by one-digit Census occupational codes, the CETA service, and the traditionality of the occupation.

Table 6 shows the real average hourly CETA wage by sex for the one-digit Census occupational codes. Without exception males earn higher hourly wages than females in the same occupational category.

Table 6

AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE OF CETA OCCUPATIONS BY SEX

(FY76-79)
(Constant Dollars)

Occupation	Males	Females
Professional/ Technical	$3.56	$3.39
Managerial/ Administrative	$3.78	$3.56
Sales Workers	$3.24	$2.49
Clerical	$3.05	$2.69
Crafts	$3.25	$2.72
Operatives	$3.19	$2.67
Transportation Equipment Operatives	$3.04	$2.75
Laborers	$2.97	$2.71
Service	$2.86	$2.54
Average	$3.10	$2.76

Table 7 shows the real average hourly wage by sex and CETA activity. Both sex and CETA activity affect CETA wages. If we look at wages by sex for the same CETA activity, males again get systematically higher wages than females. The effects of CETA activity are the same for males and females--and, as data published elsewhere show, for whites, blacks, and hispanics (Berryman and Waite, 1982). As the last column of Table 7 shows, the rank order of wages by CETA activity is:

Table 7

FY 76-79 AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE BY CETA ACTIVITY AND SEX

(Constant Dollars)

CETA Activity	Males	Females	Total
Classroom Training	2.23	2.06	2.13
OJT	3.22	2.70	3.04
Work Experience	2.51	2.38	2.45
Public Service Employment	3.30	3.09	3.24

PSE > OJT > Work Experience > Classroom Training. We noted earlier that females are more apt to be funneled into Title I than males. Once in Title I, they are more apt to be funneled into classroom training and work experience activities than males. Thus, a much larger percent of CETA females than CETA males are in the two activities (work experience and classroom training) that receive the lowest CETA wages.

Data published elsewhere show that women got lower wages than men in each of the three traditionality categories (Berryman et al., 1981). The wage differences between the sexes were greatest for the traditional female occupations, less and about equal in the traditional male and mixed occupations.

Women in CETA job training got somewhat lower hourly wages if they trained in a traditional female occupation than if they trained in either a traditional male or mixed occupation. However, training in a traditional female occupation did not reduce the wages of men, relative

to the wages of those training in traditional male and mixed occupations.

Women in CETA jobs got the lowest wage rates in traditional female occupations and the highest in mixed occupations. Although men in CETA jobs also got the highest wage rates in mixed occupations, working in a traditional female occupation did not depress their wages relative to the wages associated with traditional male occupations.

Post-CETA Wages

We do not know the relationship between the occupation of the CETA job or job training and that of post-CETA jobs. However, if CETA clients train or work in occupations whose counterparts in the unsubsidized sector have high unemployment rates, they should have less chance of capitalizing on their CETA occupational experience. If the unsubsidized counterparts of their CETA occupations have low wages and CETA clients obtain a post-CETA job in the same occupation as their CETA occupation, their wages will be low.

Table 8 shows how CETA males and females distributed across the one-digit Census occupational codes by CETA service (training and jobs). It also shows the 1979 unemployment rates and median weekly earnings for these occupations in the unsubsidized sector. The occupations with the highest 1979 unemployment rates were the operative, laborer, and service occupations; those with the lowest median weekly wage rates, the clerical, operative, laborer, and service occupations.

Of those in CETA jobs, CETA employed 80 percent of the women and 67 percent of the men in the four occupations whose unsubsidized counterparts had the lowest wages and/or higher unemployment rates. Seventy-five percent of the women were employed in only two occupations,

Table 8

FY76-79 CETA OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION BY SEX AND CETA ACTIVITY AND THE 1979 UNEMPLOYMENT RATES AND MEDIAN WAGES OF OCCUPATIONS IN THE UNSUBSIDIZED SECTOR

	Males		Females		Unsubsidized Sector	
Occupational Category(a)	CETA Training (percent)	CETA Job (percent)	CETA Training (percent)	CETA Job (percent)	1979 Unemployment Rates(b)	1979 Median Weekly Earnings(c) (Fulltime wage and salary workers)
Professional/ Technical	5.6	10.8	6.4	14.4	2.4	$316
Managerial/ Administrative	2.0	2.8	1.0	2.2	2.1	$349
Sales Workers	2.5	0.3	2.1	0.8	3.9	$254
Clerical	6.1	7.2	53.3	53.5	4.6	$195
Crafts	35.5	14.4	4.3	1.4	4.5	$303
Operatives	28.7	4.0	11.9	1.4	8.4	$211
Transportation Equipment Operatives	4.0	4.4	0.3	0.7	5.4	$272
Laborers	7.7	30.1	1.0	3.5	10.8	$206
Service	7.9	25.9	19.6	22.1	7.3	$164
Total or Average	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	5.8	$244

(a)These are the one-digit census occupational categories. They exclude three categories that do not occur in the CETA occupational structure: Farmers and Farm Managers, Farm Laborers and Supervisors, and Private Household Workers.

(b)SOURCE: Table A-23. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Report of the President, 1980, p. 257.

(c)SOURCE: Table 704. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1980 (101st Edition). Washington, D.C., 1980, p. 424.

clerical and service; over 50 percent of the men, in laborer and service jobs. For those in CETA training, CETA did not alter the percent of women in low wage occupations, but reduced the percent of men in these occupations from 67 to 50 percent.

Thus, from FY76-79 CETA employed most women in occupations with low wages in the unsubsidized sector. They did not use training to alter the proportion of women in economically less secure occupations. They employed most men in two of the economically least secure occupations. However, they used training to reduce the percent of men in the four low-wage occupations from two-thirds to half.

Conclusion

Training or working in traditional male or mixed occupations gave women higher CETA wages than training or working in traditional female occupations. However, CETA wages were consistently lower for women than for men in the same Census occupation, in the same CETA service, or in the same traditionality category.

Of those in CETA jobs, CETA employed 80 percent of the women and 67 percent of the men in the four occupations whose unsubsidized counterparts had the lowest wages and/or higher unemployment rates. For those in CETA training, CETA did not alter the percent of women in lower wage occupations, but reduced the percent of men in these occupations from 67 to 50 percent.

However we judge CETA's occupational desegregation record, the bottom line of that record for women--their CETA wages and post-CETA economic prospects--is not impressive.